

REMARKS

Firstly, Applicant appreciates Examiner for allowance of claims 10-18. Secondly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 9 and 23 to place them in right form, and respectfully submit that pending claims 1-9 and 19-23 have also been placed in position for allowance, for the following reasons:

Claim Objections

Claims 1-9 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities proposed.

In response, firstly, Applicants would like to clarify that in claim 1, urging means for urging the clip; then in claim 2, the urging means is of the actuator. The two 'urging means' recited respectively in claims 1 and 2 are same. Thus, on the point, claims 1 and 2 are formal.

Secondly, Applicants respectfully submit that the urging means is clearly shown in the drawings and is detailedly mentioned in **PARAGRAPH [0020] and [0021]** of the specification. In the preferred embodiment, the urging means is a cam numbered as 41 in the drawings, but not limited thereto. Thus, the drawings and the specification of the instant application cooperatively and clearly disclose the urging means. Thus, the objection thereto should be withdrawn.

Additionally, according to Examiner's indications, Applicants have amended the rest claims with informalities

In view of the above, Applicants earnestly submit that all the pending claims have been placed in proper form.

Drawing Objections

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a), namely, the drawings

fails to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the drawings fail to show the **urging means** for urging the clip.

With the above clarification in connection with the objection to the '**urging means**' in claim 1, Applicants earnestly submit that the drawings clearly show all the limitations of each pending claim and have been placed in right form.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Part 1) Claims 19, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Treibergs et al. (US Pat. No. 6,045,370, hereinafter, Treibergs)

Regarding claim 19, Applicant respectfully submit that Treibergs fails to show "a lever pivotally mounted to the second end with a second pivotal axis extending **along the lengthwise direction**", recited in claim 19. More specifically, Treibergs, especially in FIGS 1 and 2, the so-called lever of Treibergs extends along a direction vertical to a lengthwise direction of a base 12 thereof.

Regarding the recitation of claim 19, Applicant would like to explain the lengthwise direction to Examiner that first and second ends of the frame are along the lengthwise direction, and that the clip is pivotally mounted to the first end and the lever is pivotally mounted to the second end.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit claim 19 is novel from Treibergs and should be allowed.

Claims 20 and 23 are directly dependent on claim 19 and hence the should also be allowed.

Part 2) Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuoka et al. (US Pat. No. 5,000,696, hereinafter, Matsuoka)

Regarding amended claim 1, Matsuoka fails to show or disclose 'the urging

means is rotatable around a second axis vertical to said first axis between an open position and a closed position for urging the clip', recited in amended claim 1. Rather, in Matsuoka, the so-called urging means is rotatable around an axis parallel to an axis around which the so-called clip rotates.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuoka fails to show or disclose all the limitation of amended claim 1, and that amended claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 2-4, 8, 9 are directly or indirectly dependent on patentable amended claim 1 and hence should also be allowed.

Regarding claim 19, for the same reasons stated above in connection with responses to the rejection of claim 19 by Treibergs and the rejection of claim 1 by Matsuoka, Applicants earnestly submit that Matsuoka fails to anticipate all the limitations of claim 19, and that claim 19 should be allowed.

Claim 20-23 are directly dependent on patentable claim 19 and therefore should be allowed.

Claims 10-18 have been kept unchanged for being allowed.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that all the pending claims are patentably distinguishable from the prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now placed in condition for allowance, and that an action to this effect is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MCHUGH ET AL.

By


Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (408) 919-6137